



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,356	10/14/2003	Shaun P. Cooley	20423-08165	6704
34415 7590 04/17/2009 SYMANTEC/FENWICK SILICON VALLEY CENTER 801 CALIFORNIA STREET MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041				
EXAMINER KIM, TAE K				
ART UNIT 2453		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 04/17/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptoc@fenwick.com
bhoffman@fenwick.com
aprice@fenwick.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/686,356

Applicant(s)

COOLEY, SHAUN P.

Examiner

TAE K. KIM

Art Unit

2453

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2009.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-9, 11, 12 and 14-24 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-9, 11, 12 and 14-24 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to the Applicant's response filed on March 3, 2009. Claim 13 has been cancelled by the Applicant. Claim 24 has been added by the Applicant. Claims 1 – 4, 7 – 9, 11, 12, and 14 – 24, where Claims 1, 16, and 18 are in independent form, are presented for examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 3, 2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification states that there are differences between CRT and LCD displays with regards to gray-scale colors [See Specification Pg. 15]. However, the specification does not disclose how the current invention provides for

Art Unit: 2453

"determining whether a monitor associated with a recipient of the electronic message is a liquid crystal display (LCD) monitor as claimed.

Response to Amendment

The Declaration of Fact filed on March 3, 2009 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Starbuck reference.

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Starbuck reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice. The Declaration of Fact does not specify the dates associated with Exhibits A, B, and C. Diligence must be shown from the time the present invention's actual reduction to practice, which was prior to May 2, 2003, and the time of filing, which is October 14, 2003.

Per 37 CFR 1.131, "[t]he showing of facts shall be such, in character and weight, as to establish reduction to practice prior to the effective date of the reference, or conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference *coupled with due diligence from prior to said date to a subsequent reduction to practice or to the filing of the application*" (emphasis added).

See also **MPEP 2138.01** regarding interference practices and priority time charts are related to diligence.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on March 3, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Unless further evidence is provided by the Applicant of diligence from the actual reduction to practice by the Applicant to the filing date of the current application, the Starbuck reference is still considered prior art under 35 USC 102.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1 – 3, 7 – 9, 11, 12, and 14 – 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Appl. 2004/0221062, filed by Bryan T. Starbuck et al. (hereinafter "Starbuck"), in view of U.S. Patent 5,751,847, invented by Robert Wuyts (hereinafter "Wuyts")

2. Regarding Claims 1, 16, and 18, Starbuck discloses a method for countering spam that disguises characters within an electronic message [Para. 0009], said method comprising the steps of:

locating portions of the electronic message where the difference between foreground color and background color is negligible [Figs. 4A and 4B; Para. 0032 and 0038; factors such as size, color, font, formatting, and inclusion of the text inside of a link may change the weight of the word in the filter, thus character, word, and/or text segmentation may be performed based upon features of the character or groups of characters, such as color or visibility, to determine that weight; for example, if a word or character is white or very light grey text on a white background, the word or character is essentially invisible and that portion is removed from the message prior to filtering]; comprising:

determining whether at least one of the foreground color and the background color is a gray-scale color [Para. 0032; examining size, color, font, and formatting of various words, such as if a word or character is rendered as

Art Unit: 2453

white or very light grey text on a white background, the word or character is essentially invisible]; and

responsive to at least one of the foreground color and the background color being a gray-scale color, deeming the difference between the colors to be negligible [Para. 0032; examining size, color, font, and formatting of various words, such as if a word or character is rendered as white or very light grey text on a white background, the word or character is essentially invisible];

deleting from the electronic message foreground characters from said portions, to form a redacted electronic message [Para. 0038; invisible or nearly invisible words and characters should be removed forming a modified text-only formatted message]; and

forwarding the redacted electronic message to a spam filter [Fig. 3, items 306, 308].

Starbuck, however, does not specifically disclose that the deeming the difference between the colors to be negligible is based on a comparison of saturation and brightness values of the colors regardless of hue values of the colors.

Wuyts discloses an image processing method for determining the color or color code based on the brightness, saturation, and hue levels [Fig. 5; Abstract]. Wuyts further discloses that the brightness value of the examined color is first determined, then the saturation value of the examined color to determine if the color is colorless [Fig. 5]. If the color is determined to be colorless, only the brightness level of the color is evaluated until a specific gray-scale is determined for the examined color; the hue value is not determined for gray-scale colors [Fig. 5]. Therefore, if either the foreground or

Art Unit: 2453

background color is a gray-scale color, the Wuyts method would only have determined the brightness and saturation values for that particular foreground and/or background image and a comparison hue values will not be irrelevant.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Wuyts to Starbuck by incorporating the method of determining the brightness and saturation values of the evaluated message before the hue values within the converting component to eliminate words that were determined to be essentially invisible in the message. The Wuyts color determination method is implemented in software form and can readily be coded into the converting component of Starbuck.

The motivation to do so is to simplify the comparing between the foreground and background color of the message by eliminating the hue value determination when either the foreground or background color is a gray-scale color. Doing so will simplify the comparing process under certain situations to two values instead of three values, which reduces the load on the processor handling this comparison process.

3. Regarding Claims 2 and 23, Starbuck, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claim 1 above. Starbuck further discloses of setting a negligibility threshold such that when the difference between foreground color and background color is negligible for a certain portion of the electronic message [Para. 0032; if a word or character is rendered as white or very light grey text on a white background, the word or character is essentially invisible], said portion is invisible or nearly invisible to a typical human viewer of the electronic message [Para. 0033; if these words are included white-on-white color, the words may make the message less spam-like according to filters and

users would not see them at all].

4. Regarding Claims 3, 9, and 17, Starbuck, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claims 1 and 16 above. Wuyts further discloses that, responsive to neither the foreground color nor the background color being a gray-scale color, the color determination step includes determining the hue, saturation, and brightness [Fig. 5].

5. Regarding Claims 7 and 8, Starbuck, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claim 1 above. Neither Starbuck nor Wuyts specifically disclose of determining whether or not the differences in brightness, saturation, or hue between the foreground and background are negligible based on certain percentages.

Applicant has failed to seasonably challenge the Examiner's assertions of well known subject matter in the previous Office action(s) pursuant to the requirements set forth under MPEP §2144.03. A "seasonable challenge" is an explicit demand for evidence set forth by Applicant in the next response. Accordingly, the claim limitations the Examiner considered as "well known" in the first Office action, i.e. *"the negligibility of an electronic message can be determined if there are small percentage differences in the brightness, saturation, and hue of the foreground to the background,"* are now established as admitted prior art of record for the course of the prosecution. See *In re Chevenard*, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

Furthermore, the percentage differences in saturation, brightness, and hue to determine whether or not the text is negligible can vary depending on the designer's preferences. To determine if the difference between the foreground and background color is negligible when: a) the difference in saturation between foreground and background is less than 5% and the difference in brightness between foreground and

Art Unit: 2453

background is less than 4%, or b) the difference in saturation between foreground and background is less than 3% and the difference in brightness between foreground and background is less than 2%, would have been a designer's choice in implementing the system taught by Starbuck, in view of Wuyts.

6. Regarding Claim 11, Starbuck, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claim 9 above. Neither Starbuck nor Wuyts specifically disclose of determining whether or not the differences in brightness, saturation, or hue between the foreground and background are negligible based on certain degrees and percentages.

Applicant has failed to seasonably challenge the Examiner's assertions of well known subject matter in the previous Office action(s) pursuant to the requirements set forth under MPEP §2144.03. A "seasonable challenge" is an explicit demand for evidence set forth by Applicant in the next response. Accordingly, the claim limitations the Examiner considered as "well known" in the first Office action, i.e. *"the negligibility of an electronic message can be determined if there are small percentage differences in the brightness, saturation, and hue of the foreground to the background,"* are now established as admitted prior art of record for the course of the prosecution. See *In re Chevenard*, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

Furthermore, the percentage or degrees of differences in saturation, brightness, and hue to determine whether or not the text is negligible can vary depending on the designer's preferences. To determine if the difference between the foreground and background color is negligible when the difference in hue between foreground and background is less than 4 degrees and the combined difference in saturation and

brightness values of the foreground and background is less than 12%, would have been a designer's choice in implementing the system taught by Starbuck, in view of Wuyts.

7. Regarding Claims 12, 15, and 20, Starbuck discloses all the limitations of Claims 1 and 18 above. Starbuck further discloses that the electronic message consists of e-mail [Para. 0009], and the locating step comprises using a HTML parser [Para. 0009; HTML rendering engine to strip the HTML instruction for all non-substantive aspects of the message].

8. Regarding Claim 19, Starbuck, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claim 18 above. Starbuck further discloses that the locating step comprises using a color comparison module [Para. 0032; system examines the color of the various words in comparison to the background].

9. Regarding Claim 14, Starbuck, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claim 1 above. Starbuck further discloses that the spam filter is responsive to characters within the electronic message [Para. 0032 and 0038; invisible or nearly invisible words and characters should be removed so the spam filter will not be confused by their presence].

10. Regarding Claims 21 and 22, Starbuck, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claims 1 and 16 above. Wuyts further discloses that the saturation value is compared to a reference value to determine if that particular color is one of gray-scale color [Fig. 5]. Since the designer of the comparison module in Starbuck will determine the reference value, it would have been the designer's choice to select the reference value to be so that the saturation value of the examined color is be zero to be determined to be one of gray-scale color.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Starbucks, in view of Wuyts, ,in further view of U.S. Appl. 2002/0113801, filed by Maire Reavy et al. (hereinafter “Reavy”).

11. Regarding Claim 4, Starbucks, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claim 3 above. Starbucks nor Wuyts, however, specifically discloses that the red, green, and blue components of the foreground and background colors in the electronic message is converted into hue, saturation, and brightness values.

Reavy discloses that the hue of the foreground and background must be evaluated, including the red, green and blue components of the background and foreground, to determine the legibility of the text to a user on a display [Fig. 1, items 104 and 106; Para. 0010, 0036, 0037]. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to evaluate the red, green and blue components of the background and foreground to determine the visibility of text within an electronic message. The electronic message would be viewed by a user on a display terminal and the legibility would be determined by the red, green and blue components to determine the hue of the background and foreground comparisons between the foreground and background. This would allow the determination of whether or not the text within the electronic message is visible to the user.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Starbucks, in view of Wuyts, ,in further view of U.S. Appl. 2002/0163527, filed by Dong S. Park (hereinafter “Park”).

12. Regarding Claim 24, Starbucks, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claim 1 above. Starbucks further discloses of setting a negligibility threshold such that

Art Unit: 2453

when the difference between foreground color and background color is negligible for a certain portion of the electronic message [Para. 0032; if a word or character is rendered as white or very light grey text on a white background, the word or character is essentially invisible], said portion is invisible or nearly invisible to a typical human viewer of the electronic message [Para. 0033; if these words are included white-on-white color, the words may make the message less spam-like according to filters and users would not see them at all].

Wuyts further discloses that the saturation value is compared to a reference value to determine if that particular color is one of gray-scale color [Fig. 5]. Since the designer of the comparison module in Starbuck will determine the reference value, it would have been the designer's choice to select the reference value to be so that the saturation value of the examined color is be zero to be determined to be one of gray-scale color.

However, neither Starbuck nor Wuyts specifically disclose of determining whether a monitor associated with a recipient of the electronic message is a liquid crystal display (LCD) monitor.

Park discloses of a system and method for a user to adjust the display characteristics of a particular monitor based on the type of monitor [Abstract, Figs. 1 and 2]. Park further discloses that the system first determines whether if the monitor is a LCD monitor before changing the visual range of the monitor [Fig. 2] and that the images viewed by a user of a LCD monitor are different from other monitors [Para. 0062]. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Park with Starbuck and Wuyts to adjust the filtering system

Art Unit: 2453

to the gray-scale colors of the LCD monitor. The motivation to do so is to adjust the filtering system accordingly to catch "invisible" text since the images viewed by a user of a LCD monitor are different from other monitors will be different for LCD monitors versus another type of monitor, such as a CRT.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular figures, columns, line numbers, and/or paragraphs in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae K. Kim, whose telephone number is (571) 270-1979. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 AM - 5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne, can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for

Art Unit: 2453

submitting all Official communications is (703) 872-9306. The fax phone number for submitting informal communications such as drafts, proposed amendments, etc., may be faxed directly to the examiner at (571) 270-2979.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

/Tae K. Kim/
Examiner, Art Unit 2453

April 10, 2009

/Moustafa M Meky/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2457